



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CK

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,746	02/26/2004	Jonathan Weston	I 98376 US D1	6112
31846	7590	02/15/2006	EXAMINER	
INTERVET INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT PO BOX 318 MILLSBORO, DE 19966-0318			CHEN, STACY BROWN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/788,746	WESTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stacy B. Chen	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's preliminary amendment filed February 26, 2004 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are pending and subject to the following restriction.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10, drawn to a structural protein of Fish Pancreatic Disease virus (FPDV), classified in class 424, subclass 204.1.

- Further restriction is required if this Group is elected. Applicant must elect one structural protein and its corresponding amino acid sequence from the following:

- A. Capsid protein – SEQ ID NO: 4
- B. E1 protein – SEQ ID NO: 8
- C. E2 protein – SEQ ID NO: 6
- D. E3 protein – SEQ ID NO: 5
- E. 6K protein – SEQ ID NO: 7
- F. 6K protein (longer variant) – SEQ ID NO: 15

II. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 12 drawn to a nucleic acid encoding one or more structural proteins of FPDV , classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

- Further restriction is required if this Group is elected. Applicant must elect one structural protein and its corresponding amino acid sequence from the following:

- G. Capsid – nucleotides 1222-2067 of SEQ ID NO: 1
- H. E1 – nucleotides 3691-5076 of SEQ ID NO: 1
- I. E2 – nucleotides 2281-3594 of SEQ ID NO: 1
- J. E3 – nucleotides 2068-2280 of SEQ ID NO: 1
- K. 6K – nucleotides 3595-3690 of SEQ ID NO: 1
- L. 6K (longer variant) – SEQ ID NO: 14

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The polypeptide of Group I and polynucleotide of Group II are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules. While the polypeptides of Group I can be made by methods using the polynucleotides that fall within the scope of Group II, they can also be recovered from a natural source using biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of Groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of Groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have

described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I and II together.

Election of one of A-F in Group I, and one of G-L of Group II is required. The sequences encoding the various polypeptides (capsid, E1, E2, E3, 6K and the longer variant of 6K) that are not identical, thus requiring a separate search in the polypeptide or nucleic acid databases. The Office does not have the resources to search for all of the sequences claimed. Further, the polypeptides themselves (and the polynucleotides encoding them) are drawn to protein products that do not share structure or function. A search of the literature for the capsid protein of FPDV will not necessarily reveal literature pertaining to the other structural proteins of the p130 ORF.

Note that by searching one of A-F in Group I, and one of G-L of Group II, SEQ ID NO: 3 and SEQ ID NO: 1 are necessarily being searched, respectively. Sequences A-F and G-L are sequences within SEQ ID NO: 3 and SEQ ID NO: 1, respectively.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the literature and sequence search required for Group I is not required for Group II, and therefore a serious burden, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an

inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where Applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to

Art Unit: 1648

maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

5. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stacy B. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-0896. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James C. Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Stacy B. Chen
February 13, 2006